

Georgia Southern University Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Faculty Senate Index

Faculty Senate Documents

10-25-2001

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

David Dudley
Georgia Southern University

Faculty Welfare Committee

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Dudley, David and Faculty Welfare Committee, "Promotion and Tenure Guidelines" (2001). *Faculty Senate Index*. 562.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index/562>

This motion request is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Documents at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Index by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Approved by the Senate: 10/25/2001

Not Approved by the Senate:

Approved by the President: 10/31/2001

Not Approved by the President:

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines 10-25-2001

10/25/2001

Question:

Rationale:

SEC Response:

Senate Response:

6/27/2001: Dr. David Dudley (Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee) presented to the Senate the revised Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion. The guidelines were provided to the Faculty Welfare Committee by the Provost's Office for review this past spring. An ad hoc subcommittee (Nigel Davies, Shawn Forbes, Ann Hamilton, Bruce McLean, and David Dudley), working with the Provost's Office, made revisions to those guidelines, primarily for style and clarification of wording. The full Senate Faculty Welfare Committee will meet to make recommendations to the Senate in time for the first meeting of the Senate this fall. Senators are asked to review the document in preparation for that meeting.

10/25/2001: Faculty Evaluation Policy: Dr. David Dudley, Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee Motion: Dr. David Dudley (CLASS) moved that the Faculty Senate adopt the revised tenure and promotion guidelines document.

Some corrections to the document were made, including the correct spelling of the name Charles E. Glassick and the changing of the word "criteria" to "area" on page 5, paragraph 2.

Dr. Mark Kostin (COE) asked what role the Senate or any other faculty group played in the development of the Faculty Attributes mentioned in the Introduction and what role such attributes would have in promotion and tenure decisions of those hired before the attributes were described. Dr. Vandegrift responded that the Faculty Attributes had come from the Deans' Council and, as a part of the tenure and promotion guidelines document, had been under consideration by the Senate and its committees for several months.

Promotion and tenure recommendations are made by departments and those departments would probably not rely heavily on this checklist.

Dr. Schille asked if the lack of a terminal degree (a desired Faculty Attribute) would be cause for dismissal on post tenure review. Dr. Vandegrift responded that he did not think it would be a reason for dismissal. For tenure applications, especially when the candidate had been hired with the expectation of earning the doctorate before applying for tenure, it would be appropriate to consider the lack of the terminal degree a factor. It might also have an impact on promotion applications.

Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) asked if the Faculty Attributes might be used by the Deans' Council when acting as an advisory committee to the Provost on the subject of promotion. Dr. Vandegrift responded that the promotion discussions focus on the quality of the individual applications and because of variations between disciplines, the Faculty Attributes could not serve as a clear-cut checklist.

Dr. David Allen (CLASS) asked if the committee had considered the possibility of offering credit toward promotion as well as toward tenure for the hiring of faculty from other campuses. Members of the committee responded that the guidelines do not preclude this.

Dr. Phyllis Dallas (CLASS) expressed concern about the fact that the guidelines call for more time in rank than the Board of Regents minimum. Dr. Dudley responded that committee research indicated that this is common throughout the University System. Dr. Dallas then asked if the policy allowed for the awarding of tenure in less time in exceptional cases. Dr. Haney responded that it does, as may be seen in the last paragraph of the document. In the general discussion that followed, there seemed agreement that this document describes the practice at Georgia Southern rather than setting policy.

Dr. Bruce Schulte expressed concern about the discontinuity caused by granting probationary credit toward tenure but not toward promotion. Someone tenured at another institution would be eligible for tenure at Georgia Southern after two years but

not eligible for promotion until after four years. He also asked whether someone who used their probationary credit to apply for tenure after two years and failed could delay their second application until their sixth or seventh year. Dr. Vandegrift responded that this promotion and tenure document describes what is typical at Georgia Southern. It would be possible for someone to apply for promotion in less than four years. He also pointed out that the use of probationary credit toward tenure is entirely at the discretion of the faculty member, so that they could elect to delay their second application as described.

Dr. Schulte then pointed out that this document is an important tool in recruiting new faculty and its role as such should be considered.

An attempt to call the question at this point was voted down.

Dr. Clara Krug asked what was meant by “appropriate involvement of faculty in making recommendations for promotion” on page two of the document. Dr. Shawn Forbes responded that that language comes from the Board of Regents policy. The document does address who in the faculty would be eligible to provide input on promotion and tenure decisions.

Dr. Sudha Ratan asked if the paragraph about academic administrators (page 3) included administrators such as associate VPs or assistant Deans. Dr. Vandegrift responded that only the administrators listed are affected.

There being no other questions, the Senate approved the motion to adopt the document, as amended.

Dr. Vandegrift then praised the Faculty Welfare Committee for their work on the document.

Attachment: [Promotion and Tenure edits](#)